



2000 SEP 12 P 1: 55

September 11, 2008

Mr. Jeff S. Jordan, Esq. Supervisory Attorney Federal Elections Commission 999 E Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20463

RE: MUR 6010, Respondent's Answer

Dear Mr. Jordan:

Enclosed please find Respondent McClintock for Congress Committee's Answer in the above-referenced matter.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

1

Igor A. Birman, Esq. Counsel for Respondent

BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION COMPLAINT



1

2008 SEP 12 P 1: 55

CHERYL SCHMIT, ET AL	MUR No. 6010
COMPLAINANTS	
VB.	
MCCLINTOCK FOR CONGRESS, FEC ID C00446815,	ANSWER TO COMPLAINT WITH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES
RESPONDENT.	

IGOR A. BIRMAN (SBN 254391) 1029 K Street, Suite 44 Sacramento, CA 95814 Telephone: (916) 446-1246 Faceimile: (916) 447-9268

ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT MCCLINTOCK FOR CONGRESS

Respondent, McClintock for Congress, by its attorney Igor Birman, Esq., for its answer to the Complaint of Cheryl Schmit et al, collectively "Complainants" herein, alleges as follows:

SPECIFIC ALLEGATIONS

- Respondent denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 1 of this section.
- Respondent denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 2.
- 3. As for the allegation contained in Paragraph 3, relating to Partnership For America, Respondent denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth thereof. As for the allegations contained in Paragraph 3, relating to Tom McClintock, Respondent denies the allegation that Tom McClintock is or was an agent of Partnership for America. Respondent denies the allegation that Tom McClintock at any point in time solicited contributions for Partnership for America.
- 4. Respondent denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 4.
- 5. As for the allegation contained in Paragraph 5, relating to Steve Ding's agency status with Partnership for America, Respondent denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth thereof. Respondent admits that Respondent retained the services of Steve Ding to organize a fundraising trip for Respondent to Washington, D.C. in exchange for compensation. Respondent severed all ties on April 9, 2008 and has not retained the services of Steve Ding for any other purpose and at any date subsequent to April 9, 2008. Except as so admitted, Respondent denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 5.
- 6. Respondent admits the truth of allegations contained in Paragraph 6.
- 7. As for the allegations contained in Paragraph 7, Respondent admits the truth of Tom McClintock's presence at the meeting of the National Indian Gaming Association. Respondent admits the truth of Tom McClintock's personal solicitation of funds for Respondent, his authorized committee. Respondent denies the allegation that Steve Ding was its agent on April 22, 2008 or at any point subsequent to April 9, 2008. Respondent denies the allegation that Tom McClintock at any point in time solicited funds for Partnership for America.
- Respondent denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 8 of this section.

 Respondent denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations and improper conclusions of law contained in Paragraph 9 of this section.

ļ

- 10. Paragraph 10 contains an improper conclusion of law and is devoid of facts.
- 11. Respondent denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations and improper conclusions of law contained in Paragraph 11 of this section.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The claims must be dismissed because Respondent did not solicit funds in excess of contribution limits or outside of source restrictions of the Federal Election Campaign Act.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The claims must be dismissed because Respondent properly disclosed all contributions it solicited and received.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The claims must be dismissed because Respondent did not solicit funds for Partnership for America and did not coordinate its activities with Partnership for America.

WHEREFORE, Respondent McClintock for Congress respectfully requests a dismissal of the Complaint in its entirety.

Respectfully submitted on September 10th, 2008 in Sacramento California.

By Igor A. Birman, Esq.

M See Attached Decement Olders to see	and throat 4.0 holoud
See Attached Document (Notary to cross of 1996 Statement Below (Lines 1-5 to be con	
1	
2	
3	
4	
\$ A	
& GA Bin	<i>.</i> X
Signature of December Signer No. 1	Signature of Document Signar No. 2 (7 any)
State of California	
County of Sacramento	Outputted and owner to (or all most) before me on this
	Subscribed and swom to (or affirmed) before me on this
	Date day of Septate ber 2068 by
	(1) LGOR A BIRMAN, ESQ.
	proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence
***************************************	to be the person who appeared before me (.) (/)
ZACHARY SCOTT DICKINSON Commission # 1760134	(2)
Notary Public - Celliomia Sacramento County	proved to me on the pasis of satisfactory evidence
My Comm. States Aug 3, 2011	to be the person who appeared before me.)
	Signature
Place Hotory Snot Above	
Though the information below is not required by in	OPTIONAL ————————————————————————————————————
valuable to persone relying on the document and fraudulent removal and realizationent of this form to a	d could prevent
Further Description of Any Attached Documen	
Title or Type of Document:	
Decument Date:Namber	er of Pages:
Signer(s) Other Then Herned Above:	

CALIFORNIA JURAT WITH AFFIANT STATEMENT

DASST National Making Association - 6600 Do Siglo Area, P.Q. Spx 8402 - Chalanagala, QA 81918-8402 - www.Nat